



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,511	03/29/2001	Don Rutledge Day	AUS920010001US1	5448

7590 02/24/2005

Duke W. Yee  
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP  
P.O. Box 802334  
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/820,511	DAY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,11-13,15-20 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,11-13,15-20 and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 10/26/2004 to the original application filed 03/29/2001.
2. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22-26 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 11-13, 15-16, 19, and 22-24 have been amended. Claims 3, 10, 14, and 21 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 25 are independent claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 12-15, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Guedalia** (U.S. 6,121,970 – issued 09/2000) in view of **Angiulo et al.** (U.S. 6,275,829 – filed 11/1997).

**As to independent claim 1:**

- a. Guedalia teaches method for magnifying a portion of a document in a browser  
(*Abstract*), comprising:
- (i) presenting a first document in a first display in the browser on a client  
(*e.g., receiving by the client computer from the server an HTML page; Abstract/col.4, lines 29-41/col.5, lines 52-53/col.8, lines 51-52*);
  - (ii) generating a magnified display of the first document in memory at the client (*e.g., the second image being an enlarged portion of the first image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location; Abstract / col.13, lines 60-67 and col.17, lines 56-61*);
  - (iii) displaying in a second display in the browser a selected portion of the magnified display corresponding to a selected portion of the first document (*e.g., a second HTML page, generated by the server, in response to the sub-region which was selected; col.18, lines 45-51*);
  - (iv) response to receiving a request for an action within the second display; and performing the action with respect to the first document (*e.g., items 86-92 in Fig.4*).
- b. Guedalia teach image map, but does not explicitly teach “mapping the selected portion of the magnified display to a display space of the selected portion of the first document.”

Art Unit: 2176

- c. Angiulo teaches mapping the selected portion of the magnified display to a display space of the selected portion of the first document (*col.4, lines 18-30*).
- d. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Hsing in the system of Guedalia because it would have allowed for efficient caching on both the client and server sides, so as to reduce network latency for client and also boost server performance.

**As to dependent claim 2:**

Guedalia teaches a selection of a link within the magnified portion and the step of performing the action comprises retrieving and displaying a second document corresponding to the link in the first display (*e.g., generate a new HTML page with a link to a second image, the second image being enlarged portion of the first image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location ...sending by the server computer to the client computer the new HTML page; col.17, lines 56-63*).

**As to dependent claim 4:**

Guedalia teaches mapping the magnified portion to the first document (*e.g., a link to a second image, the second image being an enlarged portion of the first image; Abstract*) to form an imagemap (*e.g., image maps; col.3, lines 33-35*).

**As to independent claim 12:**

It is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claims 13-15:**

They include the same limitations as in claims 2-4, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to independent claim 23:**

It is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 24:**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

5. Claims 8-9, 11, 19-22, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Guedalia** in view of **Hsing et al.** (U.S. 6,826,726, filed 08/2001, priority 08/2000).

**As to independent claim 8:**

- a. The rejection of independent claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full.

Additionally, claim 8 further recites:

- (i) receiving a selection of a portion of the first document;
- (ii) analyzing a document object model for the first document; and
- (iii) identifying a portion of the document object model that corresponds to the selected portion of the first document.

- c. Guedalia does not explicitly teach “analyzing a document object model for the first document; and identifying a portion of the document object model that corresponds to the selected portion of the first document.”
- d. Hsing teaches analyzing a document object model for the first document (*col.3, line 60-col.4, line 9*); and identifying a portion of the document object model that corresponds to the selected portion of the first document (*col.4, lines 30-44 and Fig. 8*).
- e. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Hsing in the system of Guedalia because it would have provided the capability for reducing the number of accesses from client to server that will require the transmission of only the smallest amount of data is necessary to provide complete information for the server to update its database.
- f. It is noted that claim 8 does not require the mapping step.

**As to dependent claim 9:**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 11:**

Guedalia teaches adjusting attributes of nodes based on a magnification factor (*col.16, lines 58-col.17, line 10*).

**As to independent claim 19:**

Guedalia teaches adjusting attributes of nodes based on a magnification factor (*col.16, lines 58-col.17, line 10*).

**As to independent claim 19:**

It is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 20:**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 22:**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 11, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to independent claim 25:**

It is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to dependent claim 26:**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

6. Claims 5-7 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Guedalia** in view of **Angiulo et al.** as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of **Aratani** (U.S. 6,121,970 – issued 09/2000).



*line 17), and populating pixels in the second display to form a magnified display (col.14, line 62 – col.15, line 10), but the combination of Guedalia and Angiulo does not explicitly teach “reading pixels from video memory for the magnified portion in a normal display space for the original document.”*

- b. Aratani teaches reading pixels from video memory for the magnified portion in a normal display space for the original document (*e.g., an HTML document formed on the assumption of being seen with a resolution of 1,024\*768 is read. The application program performs magnifying processing for all font data; col.7, lines 41-61*).
- c. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Aratani in the system of Guedalia as modified by Angiulo because it would have provided the capability for efficient caching on both the client and server sides, so as to reduce network latency for the client and also boost server performance.

**As to dependent claim 6:**

Guedalia teaches populating pixels in the second display comprises for each pixel of the normal display space, populating adjacent pixels based on the magnification factor (*col.14, line 62-col.15, line 10*).

**As to dependent claim 7:**

Guedalia teaches mapping a magnified display space for the magnified portion to corresponding pixels in a normal display space for the original document (*e.g., The*

*response image portion is magnified to fit the size of the full view window, giving the effect of a zoom-in; col.14, lines 14-17 and col. 16, lines 39-54).*

**As to dependent claims 16-18:**

They include the same limitations as in claims 5-7, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicants' arguments filed 10/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that *Guedalia does not generating a magnified display of the first document in memory at the client.* (Remarks, page 10, 2<sup>nd</sup> full para.)

In response, Guedalia teaches generating a magnified display of the first document in memory at the client (e.g., *the second image being an enlarged portion of the first image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location; Abstract / col.13, lines 60-67 and col.17, lines 56-61).*

Applicant argues that *Guedalia does not teach mapping the magnified display to a display space of the first document.* (Remarks, page 11, 3<sup>rd</sup> para.)

In response, Applicant is arguing the disclosure of the invention, not the claimed limitations. The limitation "*mapping the magnified display to a display space of the first document*" is not previously claimed.

In response, Applicant is arguing the disclosure of the invention, not the claimed limitations. The limitation “*mapping the magnified display to a display space of the first document*” is not previously claimed.

The newly applied prior art (Angiulo et al.) is used to teach the claimed limitations as discussed above.

Applicant argues that *Guedalia does not response to receiving a request for an action within the second display, performing the action with respect to the first document.* (Remarks, page 11, 4<sup>th</sup> para.)

In response, “items 86-92 in Fig.4” (Guedalia) shows “*receiving a request for an action within the second display, performing the action with respect to the first document.*”

Applicant argues that *Nowhere in this section, or any other section of Guedalia, is a document object model for the first document analyzed and a portion of the first document object model identified that corresponds to the selected portion of the first document.* (Remarks, page 13, last para.)

In response, the newly applied prior art (Hsing et al.) is used to teach the claimed limitations as discussed above.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2176

Lauren Wood, "Programming The Web: The W3C DOM Specification", Internet Computing, IEEE, pages 48-54, February 1999.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen  
February 22, 2005

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER